



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2014

Job Autonomy Buffers the Impact of Work–Life Conflict on Organizational Outcomes

Brauchli, Rebecca ; Bauer, Georg F ; Hämmig, Oliver

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185/a000126>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-98458>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Brauchli, Rebecca; Bauer, Georg F; Hämmig, Oliver (2014). Job Autonomy Buffers the Impact of Work–Life Conflict on Organizational Outcomes. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 73(2):77-86.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185/a000126>

Running head: Job autonomy, work-life conflict, and organizational outcomes

Job autonomy buffers the impact of work-life conflict on organizational outcomes:

A large-scale cross-sectional study among employees in Switzerland

Rebecca Brauchli, Georg F. Bauer, Oliver Hämmig

University of Zurich

Authors' Note

Rebecca Brauchli, Division of Public and Organizational Health, Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Zurich, Zurich; Georg F. Bauer, Division of Public and Organizational Health, Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Zurich, Zurich; Oliver Hämmig, Division of Public and Organizational Health, Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

The data collection was funded and supported by the four participating companies. Suva's PROGRÈS Foundation provided the funding for data preparation and analyses. Suva is the largest sponsor of mandatory accident insurance in Switzerland.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rebecca Brauchli, Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine (University of Zurich), Hirschengraben 84, CH-8001 Zurich, Email: rebecca.brauchli@ifspm.uzh.ch, Telephone: +41 44 634 49 72, Fax: +41 44 634 49 86

Abstract

The objectives of this study were, first, to examine domain-specific antecedents of work-life conflict (i.e., job demands and home demands), second, to investigate, turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as outcomes of work-life conflict relevant to organizations, and, finally, to study the role of job autonomy as a buffer between work-life conflict and these organizational outcomes. Data were collected from four large organizations with a total sample of 6,091 employees. The results indicated that high time-related job demands seem to be a major antecedent of work-to-life conflict (WLC), while home demands predicted life-to-work conflict (LWC). Moreover, analyses showed that WLC rather than LWC predicts turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In addition, results suggest that job autonomy is a buffer associated with WLC and organizational outcomes, since all two-way interactions were significant, but not with LWC, since respective interactions were not significant.

Keywords: work-life conflict, job autonomy, turnover intention, job satisfaction, organizational commitment.

Introduction

Social trends over recent decades suggest that work-life issues will become increasingly important (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Changes such as increased participation of women in the workforce, greater numbers of working single parents or dual earner couples have progressively challenged employers, employees and policymakers – also in Switzerland. Thus, it is important to develop interventions aimed at reducing potential conflicts between demands from work and private life that consequently enhance employees' life domain balance (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Thompson & Prottas, 2005). Research has shown that excessive conflicts between work and private life are not only associated with occupational health problems, such as burnout, substance abuse or musculoskeletal disorders (international studies: Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Jansen, Kant, Kristensen, & Nijhuis, 2003; Judge & Colquitt, 2004; Swiss studies: Brauchli, Hämmig, & Bauer, 2011; Hämmig, Knecht, Läubli, & Bauer, 2011). They also can lead to adverse organizational outcomes: increased turnover intention and absenteeism, reduced organizational commitment, job performance and job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2000; Batt & Valcour, 2003; Boles, Howard, & Donofrio, 2001; Geurts et al., 2005; Goff, Mount, & Jamison, 1990; Marchand, Demers, & Durand, 2005). As a result, this issue has generated remarkable research interest over recent years; especially as regards work-family conflict (WFC).

Work-family conflict / Work-life conflict

Conflicts between work and private life occur “when demands of participation in one domain are incompatible with demands of participation in the other domain” (Adams, King, & King, 1996, p. 411). WFC is bidirectional in nature. A conflict can originate either in the private or the work environment (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997). Problems at work can interfere with private life (work-to-family or work-to-life conflict) and problems in private life can affect work (family-to-work or life-to-work conflict) (Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991).

Due to the focus on the family as counterpart of work, work-family research usually includes only employees with dependent children living at home. Consequently it excludes conflicts resulting from other sources in private life than family (Blundson, Blyton, Reed, & Dasmalchian, 2006). Since

single employees also experience significant non-work lives (e.g., community and extended family responsibilities, social life) the current study extends the concept of work-family conflict to work-life conflict (including the two conceptually assumed directions work-to-life conflict and life-to-work conflict), indicating the broader focus on the whole private life. For reasons of parsimony, we use the term work-to-life conflict (WLC) and life-to-work conflict (LWC), respectively, in the following even though most studies only study WFC.

Work-to-life conflict and life-to-work conflict and its differential antecedents

It is widely accepted (and has been shown by various studies) that antecedents of WLC and LWC are domain-specific, i.e. predictors of WLC reside primarily in the work domain, whereas predictors of LWC reside in the non-work domain (Greenhaus & Allen, 2010). Role conflict theory proposes that work and family domains are incompatible due to their distinct norms and requirements (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). These norms and requirements are usually different within the work and the non-work domain and, thus, conflicts may have differential antecedents depending on whether the source of the conflict lies in the work domain (WLC) or in the non-work domain (LWC): Factors related to individuals' job are rather associated with WLC than with LWC, whereas factors related to individuals' non-work life are rather associated with LWC than with WLC (Byron, 2005; Carlson & Frone, 2003). Results of Byron's (2005) meta-analytic review support the differentiation between WLC and LWC concerning their antecedents, i.e. job demands, such as hours spent at work or job stress tend to associate with WLC, whereas home demands, such as number of children or family stress, tend to associate with LWC.

In this study we included domain-specific antecedents, i.e. job demands on the one hand and home demands on the other) and formulate the following hypotheses concerning the antecedents of work-life conflict:

Hypothesis 1a: Time-related job demands (namely frequent changes of working time, long work days, overtime work) are positively associated with WLC.

Hypothesis 1b: Home demands (namely hours of homework and children living same household) are positively associated with LWC.

Hypothesis 1c: Time-related job demands are more strongly associated with WLC (compared to LWC).

Hypothesis 1d: Home demands are more strongly associated with LWC (compared to WLC).

Turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as consequences of work-life conflict

Numerous studies have already demonstrated the links between work–life conflict and various individual and organizational outcomes. Namely, turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment are three outcomes relevant to organizations that have been studied in association with work-life conflict. In their meta-analysis, Allen et al. (2000) found that work-life conflict leads to (1) increased turnover intention, (2) reduced job satisfaction and (3) reduced organizational commitment, i.e. reduced involvement and identification with their organization (Ahuja, Chudoba, Kacmar, McKnight, & George, 2007). Turnover intention is an essential issue for organizations. The costs of turnover are high because the skills and knowledge of employees are often difficult to replace (Batt & Valcour, 2003). Job satisfaction is important because of its association to life satisfaction and, equally, to turnover intention (Allen et al., 2000). Finally, when employees feel committed to an organization, they are likely to stay with the organization (Ahuja et al., 2007). All three concepts are consequently correlated with each other.

Since turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment are crucial not only for organizations but also for individuals, in this study we aim to investigate whether both, WLC and LWC are associated with turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment and formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2a: WLC is positively associated with turnover intention and negatively associated with job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 2b: LWC is positively associated with turnover intention and negatively associated with job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The buffering role of job autonomy in the relationship between work-life conflict and organizational outcomes

One central aim of this study is to investigate whether job autonomy buffers the detrimental effect of work-life conflict on organizational outcomes. Job autonomy might be a key factor that has to be taken into account when planning and implementing interventions to reduce work-life conflict and, in turn, to optimize organizational outcomes. Job autonomy refers to the extent to which employees are able to decide how and when to do their jobs. It is assumed to be an enabling and preventing factor with regard to work-life conflict (Thompson & Prottas, 2005). The positive effect of job autonomy is mainly explained by the greater amount of opportunities to cope with stressful situations. Therefore, it buffers the negative influence of demands (such as conflicts between life domains) on well-being and organizational outcomes (see Bakker, Demerouti, Euwema, 2005; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Studies confirming the buffer effect of job autonomy often apply insights from the job demands-resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Schaufeli & Taris, in press) and the demand-control model (see Karasek, 1979, 1998) to explain the mechanisms underlying this effect.

In accordance with these models, in this study, we assume job autonomy as a moderator which reduces the negative impact of work-life conflict on organizational outcomes. We expect more autonomous employees to be better able to manage or positively combine their different life domains. Thus, even though people have a conflict between work and private life, they are able to cushion its negative consequences on turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Thus, we formulate the following interaction hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3a: Job autonomy buffers the relationship between WLC and turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. More specifically, the relationship between WLC and turnover intention / job satisfaction / organizational commitment will be stronger for employees with low (versus high) autonomy.

Hypothesis 3b: Job autonomy buffers the relationship between LWC and turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. More specifically, the relationship between LWC and turnover intention / job satisfaction / organizational commitment will be stronger for employees with low (versus high) autonomy.

Method

Survey participants

In 2007, a cross-sectional survey was conducted among the employees of four large Swiss companies in different sectors: (1) a hospital (random sample with 46% of the employees; response rate: 55%), (2) a logistics company (full sample; response rate: 34%), (3) an insurance company (full sample; response rate: 54%), and (4) a bank (full sample; response rate: 67%) across all job positions and all age categories. Hence, the data of 6,091 participants (56%) were included in this study, with one exception: analyses involving organizational commitment were conducted with only three organizations; namely with the hospital, the logistics, and the insurance sample ($N = 2,964$).

Compared with a representative sample from the Swiss Household Panel, in our sample, men are slightly over-represented (57.1% in this study vs. 52.8% in the entire Swiss workforce), whereas part-time workers (26.7% vs. 37.2%) and employees in the highest job position (5.3% vs. 7.7%) are under-represented. The study participants are slightly better educated (19.7% vs. 14.2% with a university degree) and younger (56.9% vs. 50.6% younger than 40 inclusive).

The sample included 2,550 women and 3,396 men, mostly in full-time employment (especially men: 89% vs. 51.9% full-time employed women). Compared to women, men were on average older (5.35 vs. 4.81 on scale of 0 to 10), better educated (7.96 vs. 6.77 on a scale of 1 to 11), lived more often with their partner (70.7% vs. 59.8%) and children (45.4% vs. 32.2%), and were in higher job positions (8.6% vs. 0.7% on the highest job position).

Materials and Procedure

A fully standardized questionnaire with 171 items relating to specific work and general life conditions, the integration of work and private life, mental and physical health and various socio-economic factors was used for the purpose of the study. The questionnaire was administered in paper/pencil or electronic form, depending on whether or not a computer was available at the participants' workplaces. Participants were allowed to complete the questionnaire during working hours. Participation was voluntary and full anonymity was assured. Participants who filled out the questionnaire in paper/pencil form returned it to the project management by post.

Measures

Time-related job demands were measured using 3 single-item measures (2 were adapted from European Survey on Working Conditions and 1 was self-developed): first, frequent changes of working time (“Do your hours change frequently? If YES: How far in advance are you normally notified of these changes?”; answer categories were “never”, “yes, several weeks in advance”, “yes, several days in advance”, “yes, on the day before”, or “yes, on the same day”), second, working long hours (“How many times a month do you usually work more than 10 hours a day?”; answer categories were “never”, “1-2 times a month”, “3-5 times a month”, “6-10 times a month”, “11 or more times a month”), and, third, working overtime (“How much overtime (more hours than stipulated in your contract) do you generally accumulate in a normal working week?”; answer categories were “none”, “1-2 hours of overtime a week”, “3-5 hours of overtime a week”, “6-10 hours of overtime a week”, “11 or more hours of overtime a week”).

Home demands were assessed asking participants whether children are living in the same household (“How many children are there in your household?”) and how many hours they invest in housework (“In a normal week, how many hours do you spend just on housework (washing, cooking, cleaning, shopping, administrative tasks, etc.)?”).

Since different scales and different answer categories were used to assess these demands, we calculated factor scores (using the regression method) to aggregate the three job demands sub-factors and the two home demands sub-factors.

Job autonomy was measured using five items of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (Kristensen, Hannerz, Hogh, & Borg, 2005) and one self-developed item (“Can you take days off at short notice?”). These items concerned employees’ perception of the extent to which they had control over different aspects of their job (such as their working time or amount of work), e.g. “Do other people make decisions concerning your work?”. The items were assessed on a five-point Likert-type scale that varied from “always” to “never”.

Work-life conflict: Since no specific scale measures conflict between work and the broader domain of private life (as opposed to just the family), we adapted an existing scale that assesses work-family conflict. We amended ‘family’ with expressions which cover the whole of private life. Thus, in this

study, work-life conflict was measured using ten adapted items of an internationally validated scale assessing work-family conflict (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). To test whether our results could reflect the dimensions of work-life conflict, we conducted a principal component analysis with varimax rotation which revealed two factor loadings with an eigenvalue greater than 1 that explained 60.6% of the variance. The first factor comprised WLC items, whereas the second factor comprised LWC items.

Work-to-life conflict: Five items were assessed on a five-point Likert-type scale that ranged from “completely agree” to “completely disagree”. A sample item was: “I often have to change private plans due to work responsibilities”.

Life-to-work conflict was analogously assessed with five items, e.g. “The time I spend on private and family responsibilities often interferes with my work responsibilities”. The distribution of the LWC scale was strongly right-skewed (which is a typical distribution for life-to-work-conflict (for example see Jones, Burke, & Westman, 2006), thus limiting its usefulness for statistical analyses.

Therefore, the scale was logarithmized (on the basis of natural logarithms) for the regression analyses.

Turnover intention was assessed with a single-item measure validated by Richter (1999). “Since you joined the company, has there ever been a time when you seriously thought about quitting?” The participants could answer “Yes, and nothing has improved”, “Yes, but no longer”, or “No”. This item referred to a phenomenon known as “inner resignation”, which is considered to be a highly relevant predictor for the intention to leave a company. To obtain a binary variable for the logistic regression analyses, the turnover intention was dichotomized into “Yes” (“Yes, and nothing has improved”) and “No” (“Yes, but no longer” and “No”).

Job satisfaction was also assessed with a single-item measure from the questionnaire of the Swiss Household Panel. Participants were asked: “How satisfied are you with your working conditions?” The question was assessed on an 11-point Likert-type scale extending from 0 (“not satisfied at all”) to 10 (“very satisfied”). According to a meta-analysis (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997), it is acceptably reliable and valid to use a single-item measure for job satisfaction.

Organizational commitment was measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” using four items of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979) and two self-developed items. The items (for example: “I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization”) were reversed where appropriate and summed. The resulting scale ranged from 0 (No commitment) to 24 (Very high commitment).

Control variables: Regression analyses were additionally adjusted for sex, age, educational level, nationality, relationship status, work hours, and job position. To control for non-independence of data points from the same organization, dummy variables were created. As mentioned, in the bank sample organizational commitment was not measured. Two different types of dummies were coded: (1) we used the bank as baseline group (= 0) since it includes the majority of people which is proposed as the convenient reference group when a “natural” reference group is lacking (see Field, 2009); (2) we used the insurance as baseline group (= 0) where the second most people work: dummy I: hospital = 1; dummy II: logistics = 1; dummy III (except for organizational commitment, see above): insurance = 1).

Statistical analyses

Pearson correlations (two-tailed) were used to examine the relationship pattern between all the relevant variables in this study. To test the hypotheses, 3-step hierarchical logistic and linear regression analyses were conducted (for this analysis we used the logarithmized life-to-work scale): In the first step control variables, in the second and third step predictors, and, to test Hypotheses 2 and 3, interaction terms were additionally included in the regression equation. Job and home demands were included in the regression models using factor scores calculated with the regression method.

Because our study variables were measured via single-source self-reporting, we examined the degree to which common-method variance could affect our results. Thus, a Harman’s single factor test (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003) was performed. The examination of the unrotated factor solution indicated the presence of at least seven factors, i.e. no single factor emerged whereby the first factor explained less than 17% of variance, indicating that common-method effects were not a likely contaminant of the results observed in our study.

Results

Basic statistics and correlations between the study variables

The means, standard deviations, internal consistencies (Cronbach's alpha), and bivariate correlations between the variables in the study are shown in Table 1.

[Table 1]

Antecedents of WLC and LWC

Table 2 displays the summary of the regression analyses conducted to test Hypothesis 1, which predicted that antecedents of WLC and LWC are domain-specific meaning that WLC is rather determined by job demands whereas LWC is rather determined by personal or home demands.

[Table 2]

The results supported Hypothesis 1. Time-related job demands strongly predict WLC ($\beta = .40$, $p < .001$) (Hypothesis 1a) whereas the coefficient indicating the regression from home demands on WLC is decisively lower (Hypothesis 1c), even though significant ($\beta = .10$, $p < .001$).

To the contrary, LWC is stronger predicted by home demands ($\beta = .18$, $p < .001$) (Hypothesis 1b) than by job demands ($\beta = -.04$, $p < .01$) (Hypothesis 1d).

Work-life conflict, turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment

Hypothesis 2, which predicted associations between WLC and LWC, turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, was tested using hierarchical logistic and linear regression analyses. The independent variables were z -standardized. Table 3 shows the results of the regression analyses conducted to test Hypothesis 2.

[Tables 3]

Variables relating to demographics, work and private life were entered in Step 1. WLC and LWC, respectively, were additionally entered in Step 2. The results showed that WLC increased turnover intention ($OR = 1.56$, $p < .001$), reduced job satisfaction ($\beta = -.35$, $p < .001$) and organizational commitment ($\beta = -.20$, $p < .001$) (Hypothesis 2a), whereas LWC did so only marginally, even though significantly ($OR_{\text{turnover intention}} = 1.16$, $p < .001$, $\beta_{\text{job satisfaction}} = -.11$, $p < .001$, $\beta_{\text{organizational commitment}} = -.07$, $p < .001$) (Hypothesis 2b). Hypothesis 2 was consequently supported.

The buffering role of job autonomy concerning the relationship between work-life conflict and organizational outcomes

Hypothesis 3 predicted that job autonomy buffers the relationship between work-life conflict and organizational outcomes. As a potential buffer, job autonomy was introduced into the regression models. Moreover, to test two-way interactions implied in Hypothesis 3, i.e. job autonomy x WLC and job autonomy x LWC, we built interaction terms (Aiken and West, 1991) and included them in the regression models (Steps 3a and 3b). This way, we examined the extent to which the interaction between job autonomy and WLC explained a unique proportion of the variance in turnover intention, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, after controlling for their main effects. The results of the final model (Step 3) displayed in Tables 3 showed the interaction terms of job autonomy and WLC significantly predicted turnover intention ($OR = 0.87, p < .001$), job satisfaction ($\beta = -.10, p < .001$), and organizational commitment ($\beta = -.11, p < .001$) (Hypothesis 3a). However, interaction terms of job autonomy and LWC yield no significant results ($OR_{\text{turnover intention}} = 1.01, \text{n.s.}, (\beta_{\text{job satisfaction}} = -.00, \text{n.s.}, \beta_{\text{organizational commitment}} = -.02, \text{n.s.})$ (Hypothesis 3b).

Post hoc simple slope tests (see Aiken & West, 1991) for the significant interaction terms showed that when job autonomy is low (one standard deviation below the mean), WLC had a strong positive association with turnover intention ($b = 0.58; SE = 0.05; z = 11.73; p < .001$). When job autonomy is high (one standard deviation above the mean), WLC was less, but still significantly related to turnover ($\gamma = 0.37; SE = 0.06; z = 6.23; p < .001$). For job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the simple slope tests yield similar results: When job autonomy is low, WLC and job satisfaction were highly negatively related to job satisfaction ($b = -0.83; SE = 0.03; t = -27.55; p < .001$) and also negatively related to organizational commitment ($b = -0.21; SE = 0.02; t = -11.59; p < .001$) whereas the relationships were smaller but still significant in the case of high job autonomy (job satisfaction: $b = -0.45; SE = 0.03; t = -13.53; p < .001$; organizational commitment: $b = -0.08; SE = 0.02; t = -3.98; p < .01$). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was only partly supported.

Discussion

The objectives of this study were to investigate (1) the different antecedents of WLC and

LWC, (2) turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as consequences of WLC and LWC, and (3) job autonomy as a buffer of the relationship between WLC/LWC and turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The results showed that, as predicted by Hypothesis 1, time-related job demands are associated with WLC (rather than with LWC). This result is in line with other studies concerning WLC (or work-home interference, respectively) and job demands. For example, Taris and colleagues found strong positive correlations between time- and strain-based work-home interference and perceived job demands (Taris et al., 2006). This finding may be interpreted with insights from recovery research: For example, the Effort-Recovery Model (Meijman & Mulder, 1998) proposes that exposure to work load unavoidably requires effort. This effort elicits physiological and psychological changes in the body. These changes are reversible if effort can be suspended (by recovery). However, if recovery is hampered, the changes can persist and lead to adverse effects. Indeed, high effort and a simultaneous lack of recovery are associated with WLC (see Taris et al., 2006).

On the contrary, LWC is not predicted by job demands, but by home demands. This is also in line with international research, which is currently sparse. Peeters, Montgomery, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2005) showed that home demands lead to home-work interference (LWC). They explain this relationship by the fact that home demands that require too much effort are associated with the buildup of negative load effects that spill over to the work domain.

Hypothesis 2, which described the relationships between work-life conflict, turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, was fully supported. We found positive relationships between both WLC and LWC (though the latter were much weaker) and turnover intention as well as negative relationships between WLC and LWC (again much weaker) and job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Thus, our results converge with other findings (Adams et al., 1996; Ahuja et al., 2007; Allen et al., 2000; Gordon, Whelan-Berry, & Hamilton, 2007; Premeaux, Adkins, & Mossholder, 2007) of marginal associations between LWC and outcomes. The reason could be that the present study focused particularly on work-related correlates, so it is hardly surprising that conflicts deriving from personal life are less strongly related to these consequences. Besides, this may be due to the restricted variance of LWC (see Methods section).

Contrary to this study, some studies did not find any association between work-life conflict and turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Batt & Valcour, 2003; Casper, Martin, Buffardi, & Erdwins, 2002). A possible reason for this discrepancy could lie in our broad sample, whereas most studies investigated a specific sample (e.g. Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, & Luk, 2001). Consequently, their findings might not be comparable with ours. However, such inconsistent findings could be due to different ways of operationalizing work-life conflict (see Allen et al., 2000).

Hypothesis 3, that job autonomy buffers the relationship between WLC and organizational outcomes and between LWC and organizational outcomes, was only partly supported. Results from hierarchical regression analyses showed that job autonomy buffered the impact of WLC, but not of LWC, on organizational outcomes. Thus, we confirmed the findings from international studies (Ahuja et al., 2007; Behson, 2005; Thompson & Prottas, 2005) that job autonomy constitutes a protective factor against detrimental effects of WLC. Our findings indicate that job autonomy has a positive effect for employees (job satisfaction) as well as for organizations (intention to turnover, organizational commitment).

Strengths and limitations

This study has several strengths. First, the study population included a large and heterogeneous sample of different sectors and employees from different occupational positions (white- and blue-collar workers). Second, this study provides evidence of the presence of domain-specific antecedents of WLC and LWC (which is valuable information when planning and implementing interventions) and the association between job autonomy, work-life conflict, turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

However, this study has some limitations. First, cross-sectional data are not an optimal way of identifying causality. Although our statistical rationale implies that job autonomy predicts turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and, moreover, work-life conflict predicts turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, only longitudinal studies can reveal the direction of the causality. Second, we collected self-reported and single-source data.

However, as results from Harman Single Factor test (see above) indicated it is not very likely that common method variance decisively biased the results of our study.

Conclusions

Despite these limitations, this study indicates that WLC is associated more strongly than LWC with important organizational outcomes, namely turnover intention, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Furthermore, job autonomy seems to buffer these relationships. Since we assume that it is difficult to plan intervention strategies in order to reduce work-life conflict directly, intervention programs could focus on potentially protective factors of work-life conflict (such as job autonomy) and on particular antecedents of work-life conflict (high time-related job demands and home demands). Although the cross-sectional design of this study cannot demonstrate causality, the results suggest that intervention strategies that help to mitigate work-life conflict could decrease employees' turnover intention and increase their job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Organizations should increase their employees' ability to decide on when (flexible working time), how (acceptance of different kinds of problem solving) and where (possibility to work partly outside the office) to do their jobs. Admittedly, in certain business sectors, such as healthcare, time-related intervention strategies are particularly difficult to implement for a part of the workforce.

However, our results indicated that higher job autonomy is not expected to decisively reduce employees' LWC. Besides, to reduce LWC interventions should concentrate on circumstances and factors within private life even though this is more complex and makes it difficult to put them into practice.

References

- Adams, G. A., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1996). Relationships of job and family involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 411-420.
- Ahuja, M. K., Chudoba, K. M., Kacmar, C. J., McKnight, D. H., & George, J. F. (2007). It road warriors: Balancing work-life-family conflict, job autonomy, and work overload to mitigate turnover intentions. *MIS Quarterly, 31*, 1-17.
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 278-308.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*, 309-328.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005). Job resources buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 170-180.
- Batt, R., & Valcour, P. M. (2003). Human resources practices as predictors of work-family outcomes and employee turnover. *Industrial Relations, 42*, 189-220.
- Behson, S. J. (2005). The relative contribution of formal and informal organizational work-family support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 487-500.
- Blundson, B., Blyton, P., Reed, K., & Dasmalchian, A. (2006). Introduction. Work, life and the work-life issue. In B. Blundson, P. Blyton, K. Reed & A. Dasmalchian (Eds.), *Work-life integration. International perspectives on the balancing of multiple roles* (pp. 1-16). Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boles, J. S., Howard, W. G., & Donofrio, H. H. (2001). An investigation into the inter-relationships of work-family conflict, family-work conflict and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 13*, 376-390.

- Brauchli, R., Hämmig, O., & Bauer, G. F. (2011). Relationship between time-based work-life conflict and burnout: A cross-sectional study among employees in four large Swiss enterprises. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 70*, 165-173.
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. [Article]. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*, 169-198.
- Carlson, D. S., & Frone, M. R. (2003). Relation of behavioral and psychological involvement to a new four-factor conceptualization of work-family interference. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*, 515-535.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*, 249-276.
- Casper, W. J., Martin, J. A., Buffardi, L. C., & Erdwins, C. J. (2002). Work-family conflict, perceived organizational support, and organizational commitment among employed mothers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*, 99-108.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (3rd edition)*. London: Sage.
- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 145-167.
- Geurts, S. A. E., Taris, T. W., Kompier, M. A. J., Dijkers, J. S. E., Van Hooff, M. L. M., & Kinnunen, U. M. (2005). Work-home interaction from a work psychological perspective: Development and validation of a new questionnaire, the SWING. *Work and Stress, 19*, 319-339.
- Goff, S. J., Mount, M. K., & Jamison, R. L. (1990). Employer supported child care , work/ family conflict, and absenteeism: A field study. *Personnel Psychology, 43*, 793-809.
- Gordon, J. R., Whelan-Berry, K. S., & Hamilton, E. A. (2007). The relationship among work-family conflict and enhancement, organizational work-family culture, and work outcomes for older working women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*, 350-364.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2010). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology, 2nd Edition* (pp. 165-183). Washington: American Psychological Association.

- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Bass, B. L. (2003). Work, family, and mental health: Testing different models of work-family fit. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 248-261.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 111-126.
- Gutek, B., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 560-568.
- Hämmig, O., Knecht, M., Läubli, T., & Bauer, G. F. (2011). Work-life conflict and musculoskeletal disorders: a cross-sectional study of an unexplored association. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*, 12, 60.
- Jansen, N. W. H. M., Kant, I. P., Kristensen, T. S. P., & Nijhuis, F. J. N. P. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict: A prospective cohort study. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 45, 479-491.
- Jones, F., Burke, R. J., & Westman, M. (2006). Work-life balance: key issues. In F. Jones, R. J. Burke & M. Westman (Eds.), *Work-life balance - a psychological perspective* (pp. 1-9). Hove and New York: Psychology Press.
- Judge, T., & Colquitt, J. (2004). Organizational justice and stress: The mediating role of work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 395 - 404.
- Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 285-308.
- Karasek, R. A. (1998). Demand/control model: A social, emotional, and physiological approach to stress risk and active behaviour development. In J. M. Stellman (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of occupational health and safety* (pp. 34.6-34.14). Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Kristensen, T. S., Hannerz, H., Høgh, A., & Borg, V. (2005). The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire - a tool for the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 31, 438-449.

- Marchand, A., Demers, A., & Durand, P. (2005). Does work really cause distress? The contribution of occupational structure and work organization to the experience of psychological distress. *Social Science & Medicine*, 61, 1-14.
- Meijman, T. F., & Mulder, G. (1998). Psychological aspects of workload. In P. J. Drenth, H. Thierry & C. J. De Wolff (Eds.), *Handbook of work and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2nd edition, pp. 5-33). Hove UK: Erlbaum.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Peeters, M. C. W., Montgomery, A. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2005). Balancing work and home: How job and home demands are related to burnout. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 1, 43-61.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903.
- Premeaux, S. F., Adkins, C. L., & Mossholder, K. W. (2007). Balancing work and family: A field study of multi-dimensional, multi-role work-family conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 705-727.
- Richter, G. (1999). Innere Kündigung. Modellentwicklung und empirische Befunde aus einer Untersuchung im Bereich der öffentlichen Verwaltung. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung*, 2, 113-138.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (in press). A critical review of the Job Demands-Resources Model: Implications for improving work and health. In G. F. Bauer & O. Hämmig (Eds.), *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gilley, K. M., & Luk, D. M. (2001). Struggling for balance amid turbulence on international assignments: Work-family conflict, support and commitment. *Journal of Management*, 27, 99-121.

- Taris, T. W., Beckers, D. G. J., Verhoeven, L. C., Geurts, S. A. E., Kompier, M. A. J., & van der Linden, D. (2006). Recovery opportunities, work-home interference, and well-being among managers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*, 139-157.
- Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2005). Relationships Among Organizational Family Support, Job Autonomy, Perceived Control, and Employee Well-Being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 100-118.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: how good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 247-252.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations, and Cronbach's Alphas (where applicable) between Control Variables, Time-Related Job Demands, Home Demands, Work-to-Life Conflict, Life-to-Work Conflict, and Organizational Outcomes

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Sex	0.43	0.50	—														
2. Age	5.12	2.16	-.12**	—													
3. Education	7.45	2.65	-.22**	.04**	—												
4. Nationality	0.12	0.33	-.01	-.05**	.19**	—											
5. Relationship	0.79	0.41	-.10**	.23**	.15**	.02	—										
6. Work hours	4.53	0.91	-.39**	-.03*	.16**	.07**	-.02	—									
7. Job position	1.45	0.59	-.32**	.29**	.38**	-.04**	.21**	.27**	—								
8. Time-related job demands	0	1	-.25**	.14**	.39**	.09**	.12**	.32**	.44**	—							
9. Home demands	0	1	.09**	.23**	-.03*	-.02	.21**	-.35**	.02	-.06**	—						
10. Job autonomy	3.35	0.77	-.24**	-.00	.25**	.02	.03*	.30**	.30**	.16**	-.11**	(.74)					
11. Work-to-life conflict	2.50	0.82	.01	.04**	.07**	.09**	.02	.06**	.03**	.32**	.07**	-.33**	(.86)				
12. Life-to-work conflict	1.61	0.59	-.09**	-.09**	.03*	.07**	-.03*	-.01	-.03*	-.09	.13**	.00	.24**	(.81)			
13. Turnover intention	0.13	0.34	-.00	-.01	.07**	.02	-.02	.02	-.02	.09**	-.01	-.12**	.20**	.05**	—		
14. Job satisfaction	7.01	1.99	-.02	-.00	.03*	-.01	.00	.02	.08**	-.09**	-.03*	.39**	-.42**	-.09*	-.38**	—	
15. Organizational commitment	3.23	0.73	-.01	.03	-.07**	.01	.00	-.00	.04	-.04	.00	.18**	-.24**	-.05**	-.45**	.51**	(.76)

Note. Sex (0 = male, 1 = female); age (1 = -20, 2 = 21-25, 3 = 26-30, 4 = 31-35, 5 = 36-40, 6 = 41-45, 7 = 46-50, 8 = 51-55, 9 = 56-60, 10 = 65+); education (1 = no vocational education through 11 = university degree); nationality (0 = Swiss, 1 = other countries); relationship (0 = no, 1 = yes); children living in same household (0 = no, 1 = yes); work hours (1 = up to 30% through 5 = 100%); job position (1=other employees, 2 = executive staff, 3 = board of directors); turnover intention (0 = no, 1 = yes);

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 2

Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Work-to-Life Conflict and Life-to-Work Conflict with Time-Related Job Demands and Home Demands

Steps and predictor variables	Work-to-life conflict				Life-to-work conflict			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	ΔR^2
Step 1:				.08***				.04***
Sex	0.10	0.03	.05**		-0.27	0.03	-0.13***	
Age	0.00	0.01	.00		-0.05	0.01	-0.10***	
Education	0.02	0.01	.04*		0.00	0.01	-0.01	
Nationality	0.18	0.04	.06***		0.17	0.04	0.06***	
Relationship	-0.00	0.03	-.00		-0.05	0.03	-0.02	
Work hours	0.16	0.02	.14***		-0.12	0.02	-0.11***	
Job position	0.10	0.03	.06***		-0.04	0.03	-0.02	
Dummy I (hospital)	0.30	0.06	.08***		-0.35	0.06	-0.09***	
Dummy II (logistics)	0.70	0.05	.22***		-0.16	0.05	-0.05**	
Dummy III (insurance)	0.32	0.03	.15***		0.15	0.03	0.07***	
Step 2:				.11***				.01*
Time-related job demands	0.40	0.02	.40***		-0.04	0.02	-.04**	
Step 3:				.01***				.03***
Home demands	0.10	0.01	.10***		0.18	0.02	.18***	

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 3

Logistic and Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Turnover Intention, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment with Work-to-Life Conflict, Life-to-Work Conflict, and Job Autonomy

Steps and predictor variables	Turnover intention						Job satisfaction					Organizational commitment				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	95 % CI	Wald statistic	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	SE <i>B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	SE <i>B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2
Step 1:										.08***					.03***	
Sex	-0.03	0.09	0.98	[0.82, 1.17]	0.07	.791	0.08	0.06	.02			0.01	0.03	.01		
Age	-0.01	0.02	1.00	[0.96, 1.04]	0.02	.885	-0.02	0.01	-.02			0.01	0.01	.01		
Education	0.09	0.02	1.10	[1.05, 1.13]	23.13	<.001	-0.05	0.01	-.07***			-0.04	0.01	-.16***		
Nationality	-0.07	0.12	0.92	[0.73, 1.17]	0.43	.511	-0.16	0.08	-.03			0.06	0.04	.04		
Relationship	-0.18	0.10	0.83	[0.68, 1.01]	3.65	.056	-0.03	0.07	-.01			-0.01	0.04	-.01		
Work hours	0.12	0.05	1.12	[0.70, 0.98]	4.38	.036	-0.19	0.03	-.09***			-0.04	0.02	-.06*		
Job position	-0.19	0.08	0.83	[0.61, 1.19]	5.07	.024	0.28	0.05	.08***			0.10	0.03	.07**		
Dummy I (hospital)	-0.17	0.17	0.85	[1.40, 2.37]	0.86	.353	-1.23	0.11	-.16***			-0.30	0.04	-.15***		
Dummy II (logistics)	0.60	0.13	1.82	[1.30, 1.91]	19.94	<.001	-1.42	0.09	-.23***			-0.20	0.04	-.12***		
Dummy III (insurance)	0.45	0.10	1.57	[0.82, 1.17]	20.99	<.001	0.49	0.06	.12***			---	---	---		
Step 2a:										.27***	.20***				.10***	.07***
Work-to-life conflict	0.44	0.04	1.56	[1.43, 1.70]	101.38	<.001	-0.70	0.03	-.35***			-0.15	0.02	-.20***		
Job autonomy	-0.38	0.06	0.69	[0.61, 0.77]	41.93	<.001	0.51	0.03	.26***			0.12	0.02	.17***		
Step 2b:										.28***	.01***				.11***	.01***
Work-to-life conflict x Job autonomy	-0.14	0.04	0.87	[0.80, 0.94]	13.49	<.001	0.18	0.02	.10***			-0.08	0.01	-.11***		
Step 3a:										.18***	.11***				.07***	.04***
Life-to-work conflict	0.15	0.04	1.16	[1.07, 1.89]	13.37	<.001	-0.20	0.02	-.10***			-0.05	0.01	-.07***		
Job autonomy	-0.56	0.06	0.57	[0.51, 0.64]	104.95	<.001	0.80	0.03	.40***			0.20	0.02	.27***		
Step 3b:										.18***	.00				.07***	.00
Life-to-work conflict x Job autonomy	0.02	0.04	1.01	[0.94, 1.01]	0.14	.710	-0.00	0.03	-.00			-0.01	0.01	-.02		

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.